

Application No. 10/565,697
December 1, 2009
Reply to the Office Action dated September 3, 2009
Page 4 of 7

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends Claims 7.

Claims 9-15 have been withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to non-elected species. Claims 9-15 are dependent upon generic Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected Claims 9-15 when generic Claim 7 is allowed.

Applicant's counsel greatly appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the Personal Interview on November 4, 2009. In the Personal Interview, Applicant's counsel explained the differences between the present invention and the applied prior art (Kuwamoto et al. (U.S. 6,216,954) and Endo et al. (U.S. 6,018,298)). Particularly, Applicant's counsel explained that Kuwamoto et al. and Endo et al. fail to teach or suggest a control substrate and an antenna substrate that are both fixed on the case.

In view of the explanation described above, the Examiner agreed in the Personal Interview that Kuwamoto et al. and Endo et al. fail to teach or suggest a control substrate and an antenna substrate that are both fixed on the case.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 7 to recite the feature of "the control substrate and the antenna substrate are fixed on the case."

Claim 7 were objected for allegedly lacking clarity. Particularly, the Examiner alleged that the feature of "magnetically coupled through a space defined by the magnetic sheet" lacks clarity. Applicant's Claim 7 has been amended to clarify that the "space" is between the coil and the antenna substrate, and is not defined by the magnetic sheet. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwamoto et al. in view of Endo et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 7.

Application No. 10/565,697

December 1, 2009

Reply to the Office Action dated September 3, 2009

Page 5 of 7

Claim 7 has been amended to recite:

A reader/writer comprising:
an antenna substrate provided with a loop antenna;
a control substrate provided with a coil and with a
transmitting/receiving circuit; and
a case; wherein
a magnetic coupling between the coil and the loop antenna causes
the loop antenna and the transmitting/receiving circuit to be
electromagnetically connected to each other;
**the control substrate and the antenna substrate are fixed on
the case;**
**the coil is arranged on a portion of the control substrate so as
to face the antenna substrate with a space therebetween;**
**a magnetic sheet is arranged on a portion of a surface of the
antenna substrate so as to face a portion of the control substrate,
and the coil and the loop antenna are magnetically coupled through
the space between the coil and the antenna substrate.**

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 7, including the features of "the control substrate and the antenna substrate are fixed on the case," "the coil is arranged on a portion of the control substrate so as to face the antenna substrate with a space therebetween," and "a magnetic sheet is arranged on a portion of a surface of the antenna substrate so as to face a portion of the control substrate, and the coil and the loop antenna are magnetically coupled through the space between the coil and the antenna substrate," Applicant has been able to provide a reader/writer in which the radiation efficiency of a magnetic flux generated by the loop antenna does not degrade and the communication distance to an IC card does not decrease even if the reader/writer is thin. In this case, by arranging the magnetic sheet on a surface of the antenna substrate facing the control substrate, the magnetic flux generated by the coil provided on the control substrate can reach the loop antenna. (see, for example, paragraph [0012] of Applicant's originally filed Substitute Specification).

Application No. 10/565,697

December 1, 2009

Reply to the Office Action dated September 3, 2009

Page 6 of 7

The Examiner alleged that Kuwamoto et al. teaches all of the features recited in claim 7, except for the features of a magnetic sheet that is arranged on a surface of the antenna substrate facing the control substrate, and the coil and the loop antenna are magnetically coupled through a space defined by the magnetic sheet. The Examiner further alleged that Endo et al. teaches these features. Accordingly, the Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious "to incorporate the teachings of Endo et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ the teachings of Endo et al. since they would allow an article sold at a point of sale terminal to be monitored for anti-theft purposes."

Applicant's Claim 7 has been amended to recite the features of "the control substrate and the antenna substrate are fixed on the case," "the coil is arranged on a portion of the control substrate so as to face the antenna substrate with a space therebetween," and "a magnetic sheet is arranged on a portion of a surface of the antenna substrate so as to face a portion of the control substrate, and the coil and the loop antenna are magnetically coupled through the space between the coil and the antenna substrate," Support for these features is found, for example, in paragraphs [0040] and [0042] of Applicant's originally filed Substitute Specification.

As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Personal Interview on November 4, 2009, Kuwamoto et al. and Endo et al. clearly fail to teach or suggest the feature of "the control substrate and the antenna substrate are fixed on the case" as recited in Applicant's Claim 7.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwamoto et al. in view of Endo et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7 is allowable. Claim 8 depends upon Claim 7, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 7 is allowable. In addition, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and all non-elected Claims 9-15 which are dependent

Application No. 10/565,697
December 1, 2009
Reply to the Office Action dated September 3, 2009
Page 7 of 7

upon generic Claim 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 1, 2009

/Christopher A. Bennett, #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Dr., Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368
Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710